



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

RECENT WORK IN ASSYRIOLOGY.

The study of the Assyrian language has been hampered with peculiar difficulties, quite apart from those occasioned by the cuneiform text. Not only have the vagueness and insecurity so widely attaching to Semitic philology been felt with special force in this new department, but the unexpected richness of its yield for geography and history and religion dazzled scholar as well as layman, and the demand of the latter for more and more knowledge of results which he could appreciate found a response in the constant readiness of the former to popularize what he had found. This over-eagerness of scholarship has in part vanished,—none too soon. It was perhaps inevitable, and the wide interest which it fed has contributed in material ways to the advancement of knowledge; but while it lasted it of course hindered the progress of patient, scientific investigation, and it has left superficial habits in many quarters which can hardly be eradicated. It is this influence, as well as loose notions of Semitic languages and their laws, in both England and France, that, joined with a defective method, have prevented the one like the other from taking that part in the work of reducing the Assyrian to a science which the brilliant services of both as discoverers and epigraphists might have led us to expect. In this less captivating, but indispensable and rewarding task, the German Assyriologists have easily taken the lead. The stimulus given to this phase of activity has come in part from an inward impulse toward thorough knowledge, but in large part also from the attacks of unsympathetic scholars upon Assyriology as a whole. The first systematic treatment of the language that is here to be mentioned,—Schrader's *Assyrisch-Babylonische Keilinschriften* (1872),—was due to such a cause, and the coldness of Nöldeke, Lagarde, and others toward the Assyrian has been the spur to the yet closer demonstration of the facts and more rigid application of linguistic laws which mark the present era of Assyrian study.

The centre of Assyriology is now the group of scholars at Leipzig, with Friedrich Delitzsch at their head. Schrader indeed still commands universal respect, but the work which first gave him his reputation was done when the materials were far more meagre than now, and his attention of late has been largely devoted to matters not purely philological,—the results of his valuable studies in history and geography (*Die Keilinschriften und die Geschichtsforschung*, 1878) are of course only incidentally available for the student of language. It is true that his paper *Ueber die Aussprache der Zischlaute im Assyrischen*, of which more presently, was a positive and great contribution to Semitic philology, but for the causes mentioned, or for others, no school of Assyriologists has formed itself around him in Berlin. That at Leipzig is, if not the only one, at least the only one with such a controlling scientific method. The French students of the inscriptions are slowly shaking

off the influence of Oppert and Menant,—learned, but self-confident and biased—and that of the brilliant, versatile, superficial Lenormant, but they are not yet free from it. In England, with opportunities such as no others have had, the foundation for Assyriological work has in most cases been far too narrow, and the method (of assertion rather than demonstration) has been fatal. It is much to be regretted that the Leipzig school stands thus alone, for it will almost inevitably be regarded by conservative and suspicious Semitists as a small society for mutual admiration, in the absence of any strong, united confirmation of its results, and, still more, its principles, from other learned centres. Besides, the danger is not small that the Leipzig school, pushing its work with no independent *group* of scholars in the same field, which in learning, enthusiasm and method can approach it, will make mistakes from which timely and forceful criticism might save it. The present outlook, however, is hopeful.

Since the outlines of the science were clearly mapped out by Schrader, the conviction rapidly gained ground that the next duty was, not to attempt further presentations of the grammatical system as a whole, but to prepare the way for such a presentation by minute study of the materials. To this end Delitzsch prepared his *Assyrische Lesestücke*, whose 2d edition (1878) has proved so indispensable to the student. This well-known work need not be reviewed here. The only criticism of its general plan and execution would regard the absence of references to prove the phonetic and ideographic values of the characters in his "Schrifttafel," but this lack, rendered almost necessary by the practical limit to the size of the volume, was largely compensated for by the accurate reproduction of syllabaries and bilingual texts. The book is, as all students know, simply invaluable. Since its appearance he has published comparatively little, but he has not been idle. His enthusiasm and tirelessness have made the "Leipzig school" possible. It would be a sufficient merit to have trained and stimulated men like Haupt and Lotz. But besides this, their works have been subjected more or less to his revision, and are enriched with notes from his hand, and the press will soon show that his personal studies have not been remitted.

The next demand upon Assyriology was plainly to secure, if possible, some definition of principles. Any one who is at all familiar with the superficial comparison of roots, the wild license of etymologies, the conclusions easily and confidently drawn from *approximate* identity of sounds, which were so long regarded as appropriate to Semitic philology, as they certainly were peculiar to it, will understand the need of a clear understanding as to what was and what was not possible for one Semitic dialect over against another. The confusion was nowhere greater than among the sibilants, and here the beginning of order was introduced by the treatise already named,—Schrader's *Aussprache der Zischlaute im Assyrischen*, read before the Berlin Academy, March, 1877. This treatise furnished in detail the proof that the original Semitic š , which was retained in Babylonia down to the Persian period, gradually became ś in the pronunciation of Assyria, so that the appearance of ś for š in proper names, etc., borrowed by the Hebrew from Assyria is simply explained. The Hebrews spoke and wrote שִׁי , for example, though the first element of the name was really š , because they heard it so pronounced by the Assyrians. From this conclusion Hommel (now of Munich, but a Leipzig student) advanced, in

the excursus appended to his *Zwei Jagdschriften Asurbanibal's* (1879), to a comparison of the sibilants (and dentals) of all the Semitic dialects. This pamphlet, and Haupt's review of it (Z. D. M. G. 1880, IV), enable us to form a table of correspondences, depending on physiological laws, and therefore *without exceptions*.

Primitive } HOMMEL. Semitic } HAUPT.	<i>d.</i>	<i>d̂</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>ŝ</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>t̂h</i>	<i>ŝ</i>	<i>d̂(?)</i>
Arabic.....	<i>d</i>	<i>d̂</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>ŝ</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>t̂h</i>	<i>ŝ</i>	<i>d̂</i>
Aramaic.....	<i>d¹</i>	<i>d²</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>t¹</i>	<i>t²</i>	<i>s²</i>	<i>s¹</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>ŝ</i>	<i>d²</i>
Ethiopic.....	<i>d</i>	<i>z²</i>	<i>z¹</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>s²</i>	* <i>š</i>	<i>s¹</i>	<i>s²</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>s²</i>	<i>s¹</i>	<i>†d̂</i>
Hebrew.....	<i>d</i>	<i>z²</i>	<i>z¹</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>š³</i>	† <i>š¹</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>s²</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>s²</i>	<i>s¹</i>	<i>s³</i>
Assyrian.....	<i>d</i>	<i>z²</i>	<i>z¹</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>š³</i>	* <i>š¹</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>š²</i>	<i>t̂</i>	<i>s²</i>	<i>s¹</i>	<i>s³</i>

* Later, *s*.† Later, *š*.‡ Later, *s*.

Both Hommel and Haupt attempt to construct the sibilant and dental system of the parent Semitic language. Their results do not wholly agree, and both must be regarded as tentative merely, but the correspondences in the historic dialects, with which alone we can directly deal, may be considered established, and therewith an enormous stride is taken toward a rational, scientific Semitic philology. The value of such a fixed, mechanical law can be appreciated only by those who know the fancies of etymology to which the absence of it has given rise.

But a still more important work than this of Hommel was Haupt's *Die Sumerischen Familiengesetze* (1879). Not only is the fixed correspondence of sibilants and dentals confirmed, but precise correspondences are postulated, and at least in part established, for the other consonants. In addition to this, the book contains a wealth of new discoveries, acute criticisms, bold, but well sustained positions, which established at once its character as one of originality and power. Its prime intention, as conveyed in the title, is the translation, with commentary, of the non-Semitic column of a bilingual tablet, with a view to initiate scientific treatment of this non-Semitic language,¹ but with the further object of gaining new light for the Assyrian. And indeed the brief inscription of six lines forms the nucleus for a mass of linguistic and philological details. It is impossible to enumerate them. The demonstration of the value *ša* for the conjunction "and," in the Sumerian (Akkadian), the pointing out of a genetic connection in that language between the notions "flow," "speak," "call" (name), Akk. *mē*, and that of "existence," the great number

¹ For the helps to its study, and a survey of important facts in regard to it, see Hommel, *Die Neueren Resultate der Sumerischen Forschung*, ZDMG. xxxii (1878) I.

A discussion of Haupt's *Akkadische und Sumerische Keilschrifttexte*, Lief. 1-3, (1881), would be premature, but there is much significance in the implication (see the title and elsewhere) of two non-Semitic languages or dialects in Babylonia. Their existence is demonstrated by Haupt, *Nachrichten der Gött. Ges. d. W.*, Nov. 1880. Any treatment of these and other facts concerning the Akkadian and Sumerian, though indispensable to a full outline of Assyriological work, must be omitted here.

of Akkadian derivatives in the Assyrian and other Semitic languages, the multitude of new readings for characters and words, the proof that the Assyrian vowel, written by French and English Assyriologists as *e*, but by the Germans hitherto as *i*, is not modified from *i* by the influence of an adjacent guttural, but is developed out of the older Semitic *ā* (for its transcription Haupt adopts *ē*), a modification parallel with that in Hebrew of *ē* from the same *ā*, these are a few examples which may explain in part the great influence of the book and the high position among Assyriologists it at once secured for its author.

Another book, imbued with the same spirit, but different in scope, is Lotz's *Inscripfen Tiglath Pileser's I* (1880). This too is a work of the highest order. The cuneiform text is indeed not given, but the transcription is careful, the variants stand in the margin, the translation is close and accurate. The commentary and glossary occupy two-thirds of the book, and every page rewards the student. One of the most striking discoveries is that of the true meaning of *susu* (Heb. סוס, "horse"). The considerations in virtue of which Lotz translates it in Assyrian by "elephant," set this meaning fairly above the grade of mere probability, though perhaps less can be claimed for the reading *mur-nišku* of the hitherto unpronounceable ideogram for "horse." But far beyond the value of its particular demonstrations is the pervading tone of thoroughness. Mere conjecture is given as such. Positive statements are attended by proof. Hasty inferences, superficial generalizations, are not to be found. The work is well fitted to impress the long-needed lesson, that in Assyrian as little as elsewhere can earnest, patient discussion be dispensed with, and that no man's opinion is worth a straw to his fellow-students unless it rests on grounds which he is willing to subject to their tests.

In other countries there are several recent commentaries on extended texts. In France, Pognon has subjected the Bavian inscription of Sennacherib to a careful study (*L'Inscription de Bavian*, 1879-80). His work is an immense advance on any similar commentary in French. It is in two parts, the first containing text, translation and notes, the second appendices and glossary. The great value of the book is impaired by the absence of a transcription of the text. At this stage of Assyrian study it is quite as important to *pronounce* the words accurately as to translate correctly. Lotz's method would therefore have been better, since the text is already accessible (III R. 14), and corrections or variants could have been easily supplied. Of course, if space were not too precious, it would be a convenience to have the transcription in *addition* to, not instead of the cuneiform text, but the transcription we ought by all means to have. For the rest, the notes contain much valuable suggestion. The pronunciation *ma* (not *va*) of the Assyrian enclitic conjunction, and its identity with the Ethiopic particle *ma* (pp. 72, 162) he has recognized simultaneously with Haupt and Lotz, but independently of them, and in other points his views carry weight because he supports them with evidence. It would be too much to expect that he should be wholly free from the faults of his predecessors and associates, and he is not so, yet he often shows a wise divergence from them. The second part of his book will be noticed below, but a word may be given here to the remarks on the Assyrian alphabet prefixed to the glossary. Pognon recognizes *ṣ* as the only aspirate and (rightly?) denies the existence of *ḥ* in Assyrian. He notices, but not fully enough, the passage

of *a* into *é*; indeed the whole treatment of this latter so often misrepresented vowel is unsatisfactory. After studying Haupt's demonstration (*Sum. Fam. Gesetze*, S. 65 ff.) one will hardly agree with Note 2, p. 106: "On sait que la voyelle *é* provient ordinairement de l'alteration d'un *i* primitive." Further, any statements as to the influence of the adjacent guttural in producing the vowel *é* (*é*), see p. 155, must be made with great caution, and the theory that all signs representing a syllable with *i* represent those with *é* as well, so that, e. g. *ni* can also be read *né* (pp. 105 N, 161) is untenable. The apparent interchange resulted from the loss of distinction in sound between *i* and *é*—a very different matter. The hypothesis (p. 162) that *a*, *i*, *u*, followed by a vowelless *m* or *n* had a nasal sound analogous to that in French is improbable and needless. There is no special treatment of the sibilants. Leaving Pognon it is not necessary to do more than name *Documents Juridiques de l'Assyrie et de la Chaldée*, by Oppert and Menant (1877), and the frequent publications of Lenormant, before passing to England.

Budge's *History of Esarhaddon* (1880) is a modest and meagre contribution to Assyriology. It is in the old style, made familiar by George Smith, but utterly without that penetrative genius which in Smith atoned for so much that was lacking. It is a plodding bit of work—at many points, of course, the advances in knowledge appear—with little keenness, small grasp, no trace of original investigation. All the notes are in the vocabulary, which contains no references to text or translation, so that the notes, such as they are, are of the least possible use, and from their character one might naturally suppose that the chief object of Assyrian study was to find parallels with Hebrew roots. The undertaking was so falsely conceived, and executed with so little breadth and so little scholarly acumen and force, as to make it of no consequence whatever for philology. Worse than this, it perpetuates vicious traditions of method, and is thus a positive hindrance to the growth of better habits.

The labors of Sir Henry Rawlinson and of Pinches, indefatigable as they are, are hardly philological. They are decipherers; in that direction lies their genius, and on that field they have won and are still winning their well-earned laurels.¹

The Assyrian Grammar, as already said, has not yet been written, for neither Schrader's "ABK" (1872) nor Sayce's *Assyrian Grammar for Comparative Purposes* (1872) could be regarded as final, while Sayce's *Elementary Grammar* (1876), with all its merits and defects, is a mere schoolbook, and Menant's *Manuel de la Langue Assyrienne* (1880) shows little appreciation of the progress of the last ten years. A grammar by Haupt is promised, and will be eagerly looked for. Meanwhile, the morphology of the verb is gaining in clearness. Since Hincks (*Journ. R. As. Soc.* 1866) observed the "Permansive Tense," and Geldart discussed it (*Oriental Congress*, London, 1874) and Sayce treated it more fully (*Journ. R. As. Soc.* 1877) it has been generally accepted. That it is a secondary and not a primary formation in the Semitic was announced by Sayce (*ib.*) and argued with care by Haupt (*ib.* 1878), and whether or not

¹Attention should be called to the appearance of Vol. V, Plates 1-35, of the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*. It contains, among other important inscriptions (many of them bi-lingual) the Decagon Cylinder of Assurbanipal (R^m I), with restorations from duplicate fragments, and the Babylonian Cylinder of Cyrus.

there are still those who doubt it, the fact grows more certain all the while. As to the distinction between the Imperfect (Present or Future) and the Aorist (Past tense formed by prefixes) it is necessary to criticize only the mode of statement adopted by Sayce and Pognon (Part II). They are both inclined to believe (Pognon too hesitatingly) that the doubling of the 2d radical in the Present Qal is for the *eye* only, to show that the previous vowel is accented, and this being the case, no prominence should be given to this phenomenon in defining the tense-form. The change of vowel is the essential characteristic. Pognon still holds to the existence of an Aphel in weak verbs (pp. 144 f.). But the regular absence of the prefix Aleph in Imperative (Haupt, *Fam. Ges.* S. 58, Anm. 8) and Infinitive (Del. in Lotz, *Tig. Pil.* S. 98) make the explanation of the forms as Paël far more satisfactory. The relation between the Egyptian and the Semitic verb-forms (Pognon, pp. 136 ff., 144 ff.) is a field which will be more thoroughly worked by-and-by. The modal distinctions between different forms of the Aorist, etc., to which Sayce and Pognon devote many paragraphs, likewise need much careful study. Neither gives illustrations enough to prove his positions.

In lexicography the labor hitherto done is fragmentary. The lexicon of Norris, faithful, honest work as it was, is the product of a former decade and practically useless, besides being incomplete. Haupt, Lotz and Pognon have all done their share by their thorough etymological discussions, and Lotz's Glossary is full and exceedingly valuable. Hommel's *Namen der Säugethiere bei den Südsemitischen Völkern* (1879) contributes something to the Assyrian. De Chossat's *Répertoire Assyrienne* (1879) is a variegated compilation, scientifically valueless. Stanislas Guyard's *Notes de Lexicographie Assyrienne* (Journ. Asiatique, 1878-80) are, on the contrary, an earnest and scholarly treatment of some 80 or more etymologies. Not all of them commend themselves as correct, the fancy has too free play at times, there is an extreme endeavor to find *Semitic* roots for Assyrian words, and the judgment is sometimes at fault (e. g. in his Arabic derivation for *avelu* (*amêlu*), "man," which is of non-Semitic origin), but the work is of promising quality.

It is to be hoped that the great lack in this department will soon be supplied by the appearance of Friedrich Delitzsch's *Assyrisches Wörterbuch*, which has been in preparation for some years. It will doubtless be worthy of its author and increase his fame.

FRANCIS BROWN.

FRANZÖSISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von G. KÖRTING und E. KOSCHWITZ.
I Band. 1 Heft. Heilbronn, Henninger.

Since the time when Raynouard and Diez opened up the domain of Romance speech to scientific inquiry there has been no lack of workers to push forward the same lines of research into the fields untouched by them, for the purpose, on the one hand, of verifying the results already obtained, or, on the other, of solving new problems touching the origin of the neo-Latin idioms. The *Langue d'oïl*, *Langue d'oc* and Low Latin have been studied with a zeal unsurpassed for ardor in the whole circle of philological investigation. In